1	Steven L. Weinstein		
2	steveattorney@comcast.net P.O. Box 27414 Oakland, Ca 94602 5101 Crockett Place		
3			
4	Oakland, CA 94602 Telephone: (510) 336-2181		
5	[Additional counsel appearing on signature page	e]	
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff ABANTE ROOTER AND PLUMBING, INC. and the alleged Class		
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  OAKLAND DIVISION		
9			
10			
11			
12	ABANTE ROOTER AND PLUMBING, INC., a California corporation, individually		
13	and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,  V.  UNLOCKED BUSINESS STRATEGIES,	Case No. 4:19-cv-07966-JST  MOTION FOR LEAVE FILE PLAINTIFF'S SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE TO	
14			
15 16			
17			
18	INC., a New York corporation, and SERVE ALL DEFENDANTS THOMAS R. COSTA, an individual,		
19	Defendant.		
20			
21	Plaintiff Abante Rooter and Plumbing, Inc. ("Abante" or "Plaintiff") respectfully moves		
22	the Court for an Order permitting it to file a Second Amended Class Action Complaint and to		
23	Extend the Deadline to Serve All Defendants. In support of this motion, Plaintiff states as follows		
24	1. Plaintiff filed its Class Action Complaint on December 4, 2019, against Unlocked		
25	Business Strategies, Inc. ("UBS"). (Dkt. 1.)		
26	2. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) requires that all defendants must be served "within 90 days		
27	after the complaint is filed[.]" As such, Plaintiff	's deadline to serve all Defendants was March 3,	
28			

1

2 3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

2020.

- 3. On December 12, 2019, Plaintiff served, via process server, UBS with the Complaint, Summons, and other initiating documents. (Dkt. 14.) Thereafter, UBS failed to appear or respond.
- 4 On February 17, 2020, Plaintiff filed its First Amended Class Action Complaint ("Complaint"), which named Thomas Costa ("Costa") (collectively with UBS "Defendants") as an additional defendant. (Dkt. 15.) Costa was the Chief Executive Officer of UBS. (Dkt. 15 ¶ 6.)
- 5. Plaintiff served Defendant UBS on February 24, 2020 (dkt. 18), placing its deadline to respond on March 16, 2020.
- 6. Plaintiff then served Costa on February 26, 2020 (dkt. 19), placing his deadline to respond on March 18, 2020.
- 7. To date, neither defendant has entered an appearance, responded to the Complaint, or reached out to Plaintiff's counsel.
- 8. Following a review of emails exchanged between Plaintiff and UBS, it is clear that UBS and Costa engaged in telemarketing on behalf of and for the benefit of Merchant Industry, LLC d/b/a Swipe4Free ("Swipe4Free"). That is, Defendants exclusively sold Swipe4Free's products and services and acted as an affiliate of Swipe4Free.
- 9. As such, Plaintiff now seeks to amend his Complaint to add Swipe4Free as an additional defendant.
- 10. "A district court 'should freely give leave' to amend a pleading 'when justice so requires." Willner v. Manpower Inc., No. 11-CV-02846-JST, 2013 WL 3339443, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. July 1, 2013) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 15). "Four factors are commonly used to determine the propriety of a motion for leave to amend. These are: bad faith, undue delay, prejudice to the opposing party, and futility of amendment." *Id.* (citing *DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton*, 833 F.2d 183, 186 (9th Cir.1987)). However, not "all factors merit equal weight". *Id.* Instead, "it is the consideration of prejudice to the opposing party that carries the greatest weight." *Id.* (citing

Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir.2003)).

- 11. Further, the Court may also extend the deadline for service of process upon finding good cause for failing to serve the defendant in the required time. *Gillis v. City & Cty. of San Francisco*, No. C 08-3871 SBA, 2009 WL 5215400, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 28, 2009). "Good cause means, at a minimum, excusable neglect." *Id.* (citing *Boudette v. Barnette*, 923 F.2d 754, 756 (9th Cir.1991)). "The Court, in its discretion, may grant an extension even in the absence of good cause." *Id.*
- 12. Here, Plaintiff moves the Court for leave to amend its complaint to include Swipe4Free as an additional defendant. Swipe4Free received the benefit of, knew about, and ratified all of the calls placed by UBS and Costa. That is, UBS was the affiliate of Swipe4Free and exclusively sold Swipe4Free's products. After UBS sold its products, Swipe4Free provided all support and customer service for the products sold. Indeed, Swipe4Free is a responsible party under the TCPA. Plaintiff's Proposed Second Amended Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 13. Moreover, permitting Plaintiff to file and serve the Second Amended Complaint would not prejudice any defendant. That is, UBS and Costa have both completely refused to respond to the litigation in any fashion. Further, refusing to permit Plaintiff to add Swipe4Free will require Plaintiff to dismiss the current action without prejudice, and re-file essentially the same action against all three defendants. In short, granting Plaintiff leave to amend would have the same result.
- 14. Finally, given that the deadline to serve all defendants expired on March 3, 2020, Plaintiff requests a brief extension of the time to serve all defendants to 30 days after the filing of the Second Amended Complaint. To date, Plaintiff has diligently and repeatedly served UBS and Costa. Further, Plaintiff seeks this extension to include Swipe4Free as an additional defendant that is responsible for the calls to Plaintiff. This extension is not sought for an improper purpose.
  - 15. Consequently, Plaintiff respectfully moves the Court for an order granting leave to

1 file its Second Amended Complaint, and permitting Plaintiff thirty (30) days to effectuate service 2 upon all defendants. 3 Therefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant Plaintiff leave to file its 4 Second Amended Complaint, extend the deadline to serve all defendants to thirty days following the filing of the Second Amended Complaint, and for such additional relief as the as the Court 5 6 deems necessary and just. 7 Abante Rooter and Plumbing, individually and on Dated: March 24, 2020 8 behalf of all others similarly situated, 9 By: /s/ Taylor T. Smith One of Plaintiff's Attorneys 10 Steven L. Weinstein 11 steveattorney@comcast.net P.O. Box 27414 12 Oakland, Ca 94602 5101 Crockett Place 13 Oakland, CA 94602 Telephone: (510) 336-2181 14 Patrick H. Peluso\* 15 ppeluso@woodrowpeluso.com Taylor T. Smith\* 16 tsmith@woodrowpeluso.com Woodrow & Peluso, LLC 17 3900 East Mexico Ave., Suite 300 Denver, Colorado 80210 18 Telephone: (720) 213-0675 Facsimile: (303) 927-0809 19 \*Pro Hac Vice 20 Counsel for Plaintiff and the Putative Class 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

	Case 4:19-cv-07966-JST Document 21 Filed 03/24/20 Page 5 of 5	
1		
2		
3	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
4	The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the above titled document	
5	was served upon counsel of record by filing such papers via the Court's ECF system on March	
6	24, 2020.	
7	/s/ Taylor T. Smith	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	MOTION FOR LEAVE FILE PLAINTIFF'S SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND TO	